

REMARKS

This amendment is in response to the outstanding Official Action mailed on January 12, 2004, the shortened statutory period for filing a response being set to expire on May 12, 2004, with a one month extension of time. Claims 1-4, 6-10, 12-14 and 16-20 are pending in the application.

Initially, Applicants would like to thank Examiner Peyton for meeting with their attorney, April M. Mayo, Esq. on May 10, 2004, at the United States Patent and Trademark Office ("USPTO") to discuss proposed amendments which would place the application in condition for allowance. Due, in part, to a new reference Examiner Peyton relied upon for the first time, Examiner Peyton and Ms. Mayo were unable to reach a resolution. Nonetheless, Examiner Peyton suggested that Applicants formally submit the proposed amendment, that she would issue an Advisory Action, and that Applicants could file a response to her newly raised arguments.

Turning to the Amendment, Applicants note that new claims 21-24 have been added; and claims 1, 4, 6, 13, and 18 have been amended. Applicants assert that the aforementioned claim amendments are fully supported by the specification and no new matter has added.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-4, 6-10, 12-14 and 16-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by EP 0982663 ("Torii"); claims 1-4, 6-10, 12-14 and 16-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,938,770 ("Kim"); and claims 1-4, 6-10, 12-14 and 16-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,314,479 ("Frederick"). The Examiner avers that the claim amendments submitted on December 11, 2003, would not mean to one of ordinary skill in the art that "there are no intermediate cables between an electronic device and electronic apparatus."

The Examiner therefore contends that because each of these references teach that the second connector portion *directly* connects to the at least one first connector portion, they anticipate the aforementioned claims of the present invention.

Although Applicants disagree with the Examiner's characterization of the prior art and the reading of the previously submitted claims, Applicants have amended the claims to more clearly recite that there are no intermediate cables between the connecting portions of the electronic apparatus and the electronic device. Specifically, Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 13, and 18 to make clear that the second connector portion of the electronic device is "directly engaged with" the at least one connector portion of the electronic apparatus. Use of the term "engage" clearly indicates that the first and second connector portion contact one another, i.e., that there is no intermediate cable inbetween the first and second connector portions.

Torii, Kim, and/or Frederick do not anticipate the currently amended claims. Torii, Kim, and/or Frederick do not teach that the first and second connector portions directly "engage" one another because they teach that the first connector portion of the electronic apparatus and the second connector portion of the electronic device are connected together through an intermediate cable.

Torri generally teaches a USB hub and display device to which a plurality of computers can be connected. Torri is directed towards permitting a user to easily switch between two computers that are attached to a single display device. Torri does not discuss the display device having a first connecting portion and the computer or other external electronic devices having a second connecting portion that directly engage the first connecting portion. Furthermore, Torri does not teach or suggest that the external devices can be directly attached to

the display device. In this regard, there is no teaching or suggestion that an electronic device can be directly connected to the display device without the need for or use of external cables.

Similarly, Frederick fails to teach or suggest that an electronic apparatus directly engages an electronic device, such as a display. Frederick teaches a universal multi-pin plug and display connector for standardizing signals transmitted between a computer and a display. The connector permits the combination of many types of signals into one connector so that a consumer may watch TV, use a personal computer, or do both at the same time. See Col. 4, lines 51-55. The use of the connector eliminates the need for several cables to carry different and corresponding signals. See Col. 5, lines 65 -67. Indeed, Frederick recites that one of the main advantages of the universal connector is that "only one cable is used between the PC 14 and display 12." Col. 6, lines 405. Accordingly, Frederick fails to teach or suggest a direct engagement between an electronic device and an electronic apparatus without the use of a cable. Frederick therefore cannot be used to support the Examiner's rejection.

Kim is directed toward a computer monitor also serving as a USB port. The monitor enables electronic USB devices externally connected to the computer monitor to operate even when the power supply voltage from the monitor's power supply has been cut off. Additionally, it is able to detect when a power supply voltage to a USB externally connected device is beyond a rated voltage, and to shut off the abnormal amount of voltage to the USB device. Notably, Kim teaches that such USB devices are connected to the computer monitor through the use of "USB cable[s]," and does not teach or suggest that the USB connector portions of the device and computer monitor directly

engage one another. See Col. 7, lines 1-12; Figure 13. Kim therefore cannot be used to support the Examiner's rejections.

Accordingly, in view of the foregoing amendments clearly setting forth that the first connector portion of the electronic apparatus is "directly engaged with" the second connector portion of the electronic device, Torri, Frederick, and/or Kim cannot be used to support the Examiner's § 102(b) or § 102(e) rejections.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue.

If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that she telephone Applicants' attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which she might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: May 12, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By April M. Mayo
April M. Mayo
Registration No.: 54,298
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP
600 South Avenue West
Westfield, New Jersey 07090
(908) 654-5000
Attorney for Applicants

464803_1.DOC
4/11/04